UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,250	02/25/2004	Richard P. Schubert	A0312.70518US00	2714

7590 06/12/2009

Edmund J. Walsh
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210

EXAMINER	
ELAND, SHAWN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2188	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/786,250	SCHUBERT, RICHARD P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHAWN ELAND	2188	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 March 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 31-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 31-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to the Applicant's response filed on 03/17/09.

Status of Claims

Claims 1 – 18 & 31 – 42 are pending in the Application.

Claims 1 – 11, 17, 31 – 32, & 34 have been amended.

Claims 19 – 30 are cancelled.

Claims 39 – 42 are new.

Claims 1 – 18 & 31 – 42 are rejected.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendments and arguments filed on 03/17/09 in response to the Office action mailed on 12/17/09 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. Therefore, the rejections made in the previous Office action are maintained, and restated below, with changes as needed to address the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5 – 7, & 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Zangenehpour*** (US Patent 5,224,217) in view of ***Applicant's Admitted Prior Art*** pursuant MPEP § 2129, hereinafter ***AAPA***.

In regard to claim 1, Zangenehpour teaches a method of operating a cache in a digital computer system, the cache having a plurality of memory locations, the method comprising:

a) accessing the new item at an address in the address space of the computer system memory **(col. 1, lines 34 – 67; the system takes data from a slower memory and puts into a faster memory in order to speed things up)**;

b) selectively storing the new item in the cache **(data is stored in a cache based on an LRU replacement mechanism – col. 2, lines 46-58 – the location which stores the entry (i.e. item) in the cache is the address associated with that particular item)**, the storing comprising:

i) associating a priority with the new item based on an address **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – all memory locations are assigned a priority tag ranging from 0 to the total number of locations. When a replacement is made, the lowest priority is identified, and replaced first. Since the address of the item to be replaced is identified and assigned a priority, the priority is associated with that new item "based on the address associated with the item" (i.e. the address was identified to be the LRU entry, therefore the priority assigned at that location will be of higher priority once the new entry is written))**.

ii) selecting a memory location in the cache based in part on priority indicators of the plurality of memory locations in the cache relative to the priority of the new item **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – lowest priority item is the first to be replaced)**; and

iii) storing the new item in the selected memory location **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – the newest entry is stored in the location from which the lowest priority item was recently purged)**; and

b) associating the priority of the new item with the selected memory location in the cache **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – again, highest priority is assigned to the newest entry)**.

Zangenehpour teaches the digital computer system comprising digital computer system memory system memory, but does not specifically teach said memory with an address space separate from addresses of the plurality of memory locations in the cache. Zangenehpour teaches associating a priority based on an address (as stated before), but does not teach using an address in the address space. However, Applicant's specification teaches that having an address space separate from addresses of the plurality of memory locations in the cache is well known in the art **(figure 2)**, as well as using an address in the address space as claimed by the Applicant **(element 202 in figure 2 uses the address space identically to figure 3)**.

MPEP § 2129 recites in part, "[w]here the specification identifies work done by another as "prior art", the subject matter so identified is treated as admitted prior art. *In re Nomiya*, 509 F.2d 566, 571, 184 USPQ 607, 611 (CCPA 1975) (holding drawings as "prior art" to be an admission that what was pictured was prior art relative to applicant's improvement)." Continuing, the aforementioned relevant MPEP section further recites "[c]onsequently, the examiner must determine whether the subject matter identified as "prior art" is applicant's own

work, or the work of another. In the absence of another credible explanation, examiners should treat such subject matter as the work of another".

Because both Zangenehpour and AAPA teach a method of operating a cache in a digital computer system, the cache having a plurality of memory locations, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to expand Zangenehpour's invention by modifying it to use the AAPA's separate address space so that it could be used in a wider variety of systems.

As for claim 5, Zangenehpour teaches wherein selecting a memory location in the cache based in part on the priority indicators comprises:

a) when the cache has an empty memory location suitable for storing the new item, selecting the empty memory location **(data needed is cached until the cache is full, then entries are replaced)**; and

b) when the cache has no empty memory location suitable for storing the new item and there is no least recently used (LRU) memory location with a priority indicator that is the same or lower than the new item, not storing the new item and treating the new item as not cacheable **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – Zangenehpour teaches assigning the highest priority to the newest item, and decrementing the priority of all other entries. In other words, once the cache is full, there will always be a lower priority remaining in the cache relative to the others. Additionally note in col. 3, lines 27-28 – the lowest priority item is replaced first. Zangenehpour's system ensures that only lower priority items are overwritten by higher priority ones, therefore the item**

would not be cacheable as recited in Applicant's claims should all the items in the cache be the same or of higher priority).

As for claim 6, Zangenehpour teaches wherein selecting a memory location in the cache based in part on the priority indicators comprises: selecting the least recently used memory location with a priority indicator that is the same or lower than the new item, if one exists **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – the newest entry is stored in the location from which the lowest priority item was recently purged)**.

As for claim 7, Zangenehpour teaches wherein selecting a memory location in the cache based in part on the priority indicators comprises: selecting the least recently used memory location with a priority indicator that is lower than the new item, if one exists **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – the newest entry is stored in the location from which the lowest priority item was recently purged)**.

As for claim 12, Zangenehpour teaches the cache contains a data array and a tag array and associating a priority indicator with a memory location comprises storing a value in a field in the tag array **(Fig. 2 – each cache frame contains data (element 32), and a tag (element 31), which contains the priority field - col. 4, lines 5-18)**.

Claims 17 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Zangenehpour*** (US Patent 5,224,217) and ***AAPA***, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of ***Abe*** et al. (US Patent 5,906,000), hereinafter ***Abe***.

As for claims 17 and 18, though the combined teaching of Zangenehpour and AAPA teaches all of the elements of claim 1, it fails to specifically teach storing the priority information in a table. Additionally, he fails to teach writing the priorities of the cache to a control register.

Abe however teaches a computer with a cache controller and cache memory with a priority table and priority levels which stores a priority table, used to record priorities of cache addresses in a control register **(Fig. 5, elements 14 and 16 – col. 3, line 36 through col. 4, line 3)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Zangenehpour to further include Abe's computer system into his own computer system using an LRU process for cache replacement. By doing so, Zangenehpour could improve the speed of his cache by retaining data within the cache based on its access frequency as taught by Abe in col. 1, lines 19-42.

Claims 31 – 35, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Zangenehpour*** (US Patent 5,224,217) further in view of ***Applicant's Admitted Prior Art*** pursuant to MPEP § 2129, hereinafter ***AAPA***, and ***Abe*** et al. (US Patent 5,906,000), hereinafter ***Abe***.

As for claim 31, Zangenehpour teaches a method of operating a cache in a digital computer system, the cache having a plurality of memory locations, the method comprising:

a) identifying a plurality of blocks of addresses in memory of the computer system and a priority for each of the plurality of blocks of memory **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – all memory locations of a cache are assigned a priority tag ranging from 0 to the total number of locations)**;

b) receiving an item having an address in the address space in the computer memory **(each item received inherently must have an address associated with it)**;

c) obtaining a priority for a block of the plurality of blocks of addresses containing the address associated with the item **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – when a replacement is made, the lowest priority is identified, and replaced first. Since the address of the item to be replaced is identified and assigned a priority, the priority is associated with that new item "based on the address associated with the item" (i.e. the address was identified to be the LRU entry), therefore the priority assigned at that location will be of higher priority once the new entry is written)**;

d) identifying a plurality of locations in the cache based on the address associated with the item, each of the identified locations having a priority associated therewith **(all memory locations are examined to determine the lowest priority – col. 3, lines 23-44)**; and

e) selectively storing the item in a location of the plurality of locations selected based on a relative priority of the priority obtained for the item and the priorities associated with the plurality of locations **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – the newest entry is stored in the location from which the lowest priority item was recently purged)**.

Zangenehpour teaches the digital computer system comprising digital computer system memory system memory, but does not specifically teach said memory with an address space separate from addresses of the plurality of memory locations in the cache. Zangenehpour teaches associating a priority based on an address (as stated before), but does not teach using an address in the address space. However, Applicant's specification teaches that having an address space separate from addresses of the plurality of memory locations in the cache is well known in the art **(figure 2)**, as well as using an address in the address space as claimed by the Applicant **(element 202 in figure 2 uses the address space identically to figure 3)**.

MPEP § 2129 recites in part, "[w]here the specification identifies work done by another as "prior art", the subject matter so identified is treated as admitted prior art. *In re Nomiya*, 509 F.2d 566, 571, 184 USPQ 607, 611 (CCPA 1975) (holding drawings as "prior art" to be an admission that what was pictured was prior art relative to applicant's improvement)." Continuing, the aforementioned relevant MPEP section further recites "[c]onsequently, the examiner must determine whether the subject matter identified as "prior art" is applicant's own work, or the work of another. In the absence of another credible explanation, examiners should treat such subject matter as the work of another".

Because both Zangenehpour and AAPA teach a method of operating a cache in a digital computer system, the cache having a plurality of memory locations, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to expand Zangenehpour's invention by modifying it to use the AAPA's separate address space so that it could be used in a wider variety of systems.

Despite teaching assigning priorities to addresses within the cache, Zangenehpour fails to specifically teach the use of a data table to maintain this information, (rather it is encoded in the cache itself).

Abe however teaches a computer with a cache controller and cache memory with a priority table and priority levels which stores a priority table, used to record priorities of cache addresses in a control register **(Fig. 5, elements 14 and 16 – col. 3, line 36 through col. 4, line 3)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Zangenehpour to further include Abe's computer system into his own computer system using an LRU process for cache replacement. By doing so, Zangenehpour could improve the speed of his cache by retaining data within the cache based on its access frequency as taught by Abe in col. 1, lines 19-42.

As for claim 32, Zangenehpour further teaches storing the item when the priority obtained for the item is higher then the priority of at least one of the plurality of locations **(again, the new entry is assigned the highest priority, and the address of the cache containing the lowest priority is replaced)**.

As for claim 33, though the combined teachings of Zangenehpour, AAPA, and Abe fully disclose all the claim limitations of claim 31 (including the data table and assigning priorities to blocks of the plurality of blocks based on processes executing of the digital computer system that access memory locations within each block), they fail to specifically teach the data table as being a cache ability protection look aside buffer (CPLB) as recited in this claim.

Applicant however discloses that the use of such a buffer is well known in the art in **paragraphs 0017-0018, all lines and in Fig. 2 (element 250)** – in which Applicant correctly identified, and fully conceded it as being prior art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the combined teachings of Zangenehpour and Abe to use a CPLB for the data table to map address and priority information for the cache. By doing so, they could exploit the well-known benefits of a CPLB including its ability to cache data in addition to storing data structures such as tables as admitted by Applicant as being well-known in the semiconductor art in paragraphs 0017-0018, all lines of Applicant's disclosure.

As for claims 34 and 35, Zangenehpour further teaches selecting a location from a subset of the plurality of locations, the locations in the subset having a priority less than the priority obtained for the item, and the location being selected according to a replacement policy **(Zangenehpour employs an LRU policy to replace the lowest priority of items with the new item to be written to the cache – col. 3 lines 22-44)**.

As for claims 37 and 38, Zangenehpour teaches associating the obtained priority with the location (again, each location is specifically associated with a particular location which remains intact until the entry is purged from the cache).

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of ***Zangenehpour*** (US Patent 5,224,217), ***AAPA***, and ***Abe*** (US Patent 5,906,000) as applied to

claim 31, and in further view of ***Tago*** et al. (US PG Publication 2002/0199091 A1), hereinafter Tago.

As for claim 36, though the combined teachings of Zangenehpour, AAPA, and Abe disclose replacing data in the cache based on an LRU policy, they fail to teach replacing the entries based on a least recently loaded policy.

Tago however teaches an apparatus for branch prediction based on history table in which he discusses cache eviction policies including LRU, FIFO (i.e. oldest or least recently loaded), and random in **paragraph 0065, all lines**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the combined teachings of Zangenehpour and Abe to further include Tago's apparatus into his their computer system using an LRU process for cache replacement. By doing so, they could exploit the benefits of utilizing a processor which performs its instruction branch predictions on a pattern history table, which could help to improve the prediction accuracy and minimize the amount of memory required by avoiding entry interference as taught by Tago in paragraphs 0014 through 0016, all lines.

Claims 39 – 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Zangenehpour*** (US 5,224,217), ***AAPA***, and ***Abe*** et al. (US 5,906,000) as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of ***Tanaka*** (US 5,555,393).

In regard to claims 39 – 40, elements a, b, c, & d of the claim are rejected using the same rationale for substantially similar elements a, b, c, & d of claim 31. Also, Zangenehpour teaches:

e) comparing the obtained priority of the new item to the priorities of the plurality of locations in the cache to determine whether at least one of the plurality of locations has a priority relative to the priority of the new item that satisfies a priority-based policy for replacement **(col. 3, lines 23 – 44; all priorities in the cache are adjusted relative to the new item after it's added)**; and

f) selectively storing the item based on the results of the comparing, the selectively storing comprising:

when one of the plurality of locations has a priority satisfying the priority-based policy, storing the new item in the one cache location and recording the priority of the new item as the priority of the cache location **(col. 3, lines 23-44 – the newest entry is stored in the location from which the lowest priority item was recently purged and all the priorities are readjusted relative to the new entry)**.

Zangenehpour does not teach when there is not at least one of the plurality of locations having a priority satisfying the priority-based policy, not caching the new item. Nor does he teach when at least two locations of the plurality of locations have priorities satisfying the priority-based policy, selecting in accordance with a usage-based replacement policy a cache location from the at least two of the plurality of locations for storing the new item. Zangenehpour also doesn't teach wherein a cache location satisfies the priority-based policy for replacement when the priority of the new item is higher than the priority of the cache location.

Tanaka teaches a cache lock control mechanism for a cache memory **(Abstract)**. In this system, a user can prevent writing to a cache by setting cache lock bits **(element 103 in figure 2, and element 105 in figure 3)**. When the bit is set, the user cannot write to the cache and must

write to the main memory instead **(step Sg in figure 4B)**. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of the combination of Zangenehpour, AAPA, and Abe by implementing Tanaka's locking user-controlled locking system. This would make the system more flexible as it allows the user to keep more-required data, i.e. a higher-priority data, in the cache over less-required data, i.e. lower-priority data, thus speeding up average access to data **(col. 1, lines 50 – 63)** and making the system more flexible for the user.

As for claim 41, Zangenehpour does not teach wherein configuring a cacheability protection lookaside buffer by assigning priorities to blocks of the plurality of blocks based on processes executing on the digital computer system that access memory locations within each block, however, AAPA does **(figure 2, element 250)**. Because both Zangenehpour and AAPA teach a method of operating a cache in a digital computer system, the cache having a plurality of memory locations, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to expand Zangenehpour's invention by modifying it to use the AAPA's cacheability protection lookaside buffer so that it could be used in a wider variety of systems.

As for claim 42, Zangenehpour teaches wherein the usage-based replacement policy comprises a least recently used replacement policy **Zangenehpour employs an LRU policy to replace the lowest priority of items with the new item to be written to the cache – col. 3 lines 22-44)**.

Claims 2-4, and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Zangenehpour*** (US Patent 5,224,217) and ***AAPA***, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of ***Tago*** (US PG Publication 2002/0199091 A1).

As for claims 2-4, 8-9, and 10-11, the combination of Zangenehpour and AAPA teaches all of the elements of these claims **(per the rejection of claims 5-7, 6-7, and 6-7 respectively)**, including assigning priorities based on an LRU policy. Zangenehpour however teaches neither assigning priorities on a least frequently used (LFU), a least recently loaded policy, nor a pseudo random as recited in these claims.

Tago however teaches an apparatus for branch prediction based on history table in which he discusses cache eviction policies including LRU, FIFO (i.e. oldest or least recently loaded), and random in **paragraph 0065, all lines**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Zangenehpour to further include Tago's apparatus into his own computer system using an LRU process for cache replacement. By doing so, Zangenehpour could exploit the benefits of utilizing a processor which performs its instruction branch predictions on a pattern history table, which could help to improve the prediction accuracy and minimize the amount of memory required by avoiding entry interference as taught by Tago in paragraphs 0014 through 0016, all lines.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Zangenehpour*** (US Patent 5,224,217) and ***AAPA***, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of ***Ozawa*** (US Patent 5,787,490).

As for claim 13, though the combination of Zangenehpour and AAPA teaches all of the elements of claim 1, he fails to teach associating multiple processes with a priority, wherein the priority of the new item is derived from the priority of the process that generated the new item as recited in this claim.

Ozawa however teaches a multiprocess execution system that designates cache use priority based on process priority **(col. 1, line 48 through col. 2, line 24 and abstract)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Zangenehpour to further include Ozawa's multiprocess execution system into his own computer system using an LRU process for cache replacement. By doing so, Zangenehpour could benefit from improved memory usage by ensuring that the highest priority process is not prevented from executing its preferential use, and further maximize process execution time as taught by Ozawa in col. 1, lines 17-45.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Zangenehpour*** (US Patent 5,224,217) and ***AAPA***, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of ***Agarwala*** et al. (US Patent 6,484,237 B1), hereinafter ***Agarwala***.

As for claims 14 and 15, Zangenehpour teaches:

a) assigning a first priority to a first portion of the plurality of memory locations **(col. 3, lines 23-44 - the most recently used entry is given the highest priority)**;

b) assigning a second priority, lower than the first priority, to a second portion of the plurality of memory locations **(col. 3, lines 23-44 - the most least used entry is given the lowest priority)**;

c) generating new items to store in the cache with priorities lower than or equal to the second **priority (col. 3, lines 23-44 - the newest entry will be assigned a value equal to the priority of the second priority (i.e. highest))**.

He fails however to teach using the first portion of the plurality of memory locations for non-cache memory location, and a digital signal processor (DSP), which uses a portion for non-caching processor operations as recited in these claims.

Agarwala however teaches a unified multilevel memory system architecture which supports both cache and addressable SRAM, which utilizes a level one unified cache for both caching and instructions (i.e. non-caching) for a DSP - col. 2, lines 55-64.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Zangenehpour to further include Agarwala's unified memory system into his own computer system using an LRU process for cache replacement. By doing so, Zangenehpour could improve the speed and effectiveness of his overall cache memory management by more effectively caching processor instructions and requests, as taught by Agarwala in col. 11, lines 18-49.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of ***Zangenehpour*** (US Patent 5,224,217), ***AAPA***, and ***Agarwala*** (US Patent 6,484,237 B1) as applied to claim 14 above, and in further view of ***Abe*** (US Patent 5,906,000).

As for claim 16, though the combined teachings of Zangenehpour, AAPA, and Agarwala teach all of the elements of claim 14, they fail to specifically teach writing the priorities of the cache to a control register.

Abe however teaches a computer with a cache controller and cache memory with a priority table and priority levels which stores a priority table, used to record priorities of cache addresses in a control register **(Fig. 5, elements 14 and 16 – col. 3, line 36 through col. 4, line 3)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the combined teachings of Zangenehpour and Agarwala to further include Abe's computer system. By doing so, they could improve the speed of the cache by retaining data within the cache based on its access frequency as taught by Abe in col. 1, lines 19-42.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/17/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues *the prior art of record does not teach replacement based on the address of an item in computer system memory*. The claim language in question does not disclose replacement based on the address. It discloses replacement based on priority, and priority is based on the address. The term "based on" is not defined in the claim language or in the specification. It therefore falls under broadest reasonable interpretation. As long as the Examiner shows that the priority is somehow "based on" the address (e.g. as in the rejections above), the scope of the claim language has been met.

Applicant argues *the prior art of record does not use an address in address space of system memory as part of a cache replacement policy*. Applicant further argues *even if AAPA were combined with Zangenehpour, the result would not be as claimed*. Applicant's figure 2, showing what is well known in the art, clearly shows the use of an address in address space of system memory as part of a cache replacement policy. Upon closer examination of the specification, there is no clear definition of system memory and the Examiner understands system memory to consist of cache and main memory. There is no indication in the claims as to which memory is being claimed. Examining figures 2 and 3 of the specification, it is clear that both get their addresses from the same bus, element 202. The main differences between these figures are the addition of the priority field, element 312, which is covered by Zangenehpour, and additional pathways between elements 310, 350, & 352, which are not claimed by the Applicant. As for the argument that the result would not be as claimed, Zangenehpour's

inventive concept is the priority system, not the location of memory. So AAPA would not destroy Zangenehpour.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Examiner's Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawn Eland whose telephone number is (571) 270-1029. The examiner can normally be reached on MO - TH, & every other FR.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on (571) 272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sanjiv Shah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2185

/Shawn Eland/
Examiner, Art Unit 2188
6/11/2009